

In due time—and probably earlier by several years than would have been the case had not the California Medical Association through its own official journal initiated and espoused the cause—*The Journal of the American Medical Association* did adopt a policy of accepting only clean and ethical advertisements. And so it may happen again, in the not distant future, that those who felt California deserved a “spanking” lesson for supposedly having gotten out of American Medical Association traces, may find themselves at last won over to an opinion quite different from that to which they gave such expression and publicity at Atlantic City in June last.

\* \* \*

**California's Medical-Economic Problems Were Explained at Atlantic City.**—In connection with the above comments, we would call attention to the informal remarks on page 160 of this issue, which, upon invitation, were made at Atlantic City to the American Medical Association House of Delegates by Council Chairman T. Henshaw Kelly of San Francisco, in reference to the subject of health insurance in California. At that time it was hoped that a clearer understanding of the California problems had been created; but later events indicated otherwise.

‘ ‘ ‘

Little more need be said on the subject, save that the California Medical Association, in the present as in the past, will always be found loyal to the best interests of scientific and organized medicine, as its members and delegated officers understand the same.

#### ASSEMBLY BILL 246: FOR NONPROFIT HOSPITAL SERVICE

On page 175 is printed in full the text of Assembly Bill 246, the same being “*An Act for the regulation and control of corporations organized for the purpose of operating nonprofit hospital service plans.*”

Members are requested to read this new law, which received the approval of Governor Frank Merriam on July 5, 1935, because it is possible that its enactment may pave the way for the formation of such institutions in many cities of the State. Each of such establishments as organized should receive the attention of the respective component county medical societies, because a misapplication of the provisions of the law could make for much future distress and complications to all concerned.

‘ ‘ ‘

Concerning other legislation\* pending before the Governor, it is not possible at the time of this writing to make comment. Statutes of special interest may be discussed in succeeding issues.

see that the advertising pages are kept clean. Too many state society journals have followed the pernicious example of ‘*The Journal of the American Medical Association*,’ and have accepted pretty much anything offered. We sincerely trust that New Jersey will stick to the policy announced, and keep its self-respect. . . .”

\* For comments on amendments to California Medical Practice Act, see page 174.

#### A LIBEL ON THE CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF HEALTH

**A Statement in the “New Mexico Health Officer,” Vol. V, No. 2.**—Last month, in discussing in this column, and on page 50, “Newspaper Publicity on the California Medical Association Survey of Sickness Incidence,” it was said:

“We trust these comments will not be misunderstood. We do not believe that members of the California Medical Association are peeved, but we do think they have sufficient love and respect for factual data to wish the simple truth to be spoken.” . . .

Now it may be added that, with the substitution of the words “California State Board of Health” for “California Medical Association,” the above thought may be made equally germane to the discussion of some lines printed in the *New Mexico Health Officer* of June, 1935 where, under the caption, “A Problem in Distribution,” are given extracts from an address “of Dr. Walter Brown\* to the N. M. P. H. A. (New Mexico Public Health Association), written during its delivery, and a verbatim report of which will be published in the columns of *Southwestern Medicine*.” The opening sentence of the second paragraph states:

“Dr. Walter A. Brown, president-elect of the American Public Health Association and professor of public health at Stanford University, speaking on April 20 to a crowded audience of the New Mexico Public Health Association, said that the protection of public health is a problem of distribution.” . . .

The particular thought credited to Doctor Brown, and to be here commented upon, is reported below, with italics which are our own:

“Why is it that the people of the United States do not demand from the Government this type of investment? We are making an advance. The United States Public Health Service has been markedly developed in recent years. Progress has been made where trained and experienced workers are on the job with adequate facilities and continuity of service. *The California State Health Department has recently been torn to pieces from political motives. The time has come when this sort of thing should cease.*” . . .

\* \* \*

#### The Statement Has No Foundation in Fact.

The above is an amazing statement, the more so since we can affirm from decidedly first-hand knowledge that it has no basis whatever in fact. Members of the California Medical Association will be equally convinced that Doctor Brown spoke out of turn, and to be charitable, on insufficient or inaccurate data, when the names of the six non-salaried members of the California State Board of Health are noted. Each of these physicians has been associated for years with the work of organized and institutional medicine in California; and when it is added that they maintain the most cordial and unified personal relations, both official and otherwise, the absurdity of such a statement as that made by Dr. Walter H. Brown at once becomes evident.

\* Dr. Walter H. Brown (M. D., Pennsylvania, 1906) is professor of hygiene in the Department of Hygiene, Stanford University.

**The Non-Salaried Members of the California State Board of Health.**—Who are the six non-salaried State Health Board members, whose loyal and efficient work on behalf of the State has been so besmirched by the ranking officer of the American Public Health Association?

They are:

Board President Howard Morrow of San Francisco, Professor of Dermatology in the Medical School of the University of California.

Board Vice-President Edward M. Palette of Los Angeles, President-Elect of the California Medical Association and for some years Speaker of its House of Delegates.

Dr. Junius B. Harris of Sacramento, an ex-president of the California Medical Association and for years its committee chairman on public policy and legislation.

Dr. William R. P. Clark of San Francisco, for years on the Stanford University staff at the San Francisco County Hospital.

Dr. Gifford L. Sobey of Paso Robles, President of the Pacific Coast Association of Railway Surgeons.

Dr. George H. Kress of Los Angeles, an ex-president of the California Medical Association and editor of its official journal.

\* \* \*

**The Loyal and Efficient Public Health Service of These Men Deserves Commendation Rather Than Libel.**—Each one of the above physicians is well known in his respective community, and the reputation of each for able and harmonious endeavor on behalf of organized medicine has been established through years of unselfish and sacrificing service. Singly and jointly they have no apology to make for their labors on behalf of the public health, and they, each and all, feel that neither Dr. Walter H. Brown nor any other person can point to a single public health need of importance in which they have not met their obligations to the State in the most efficient and agreeable manner. At no time have politics, in the sense presumably used by Doctor Brown, entered into their deliberations or activities; and the minutes of the Board meetings attest to the devotion with which public health work has been supervised by them.

\* \* \*

**Retractions Are in Order from Dr. Walter Brown.**—It is not often that comments such as these have been printed in this column, and our regret is that they must now so appear; but the high position which Dr. Walter Brown holds in the American Public Health Association and the good name of the California State Board of Health alike demand that the real truth be spoken. If statements similar to the one made in New Mexico were expressed by Doctor Brown in other states which he visited, he certainly owes it to himself, to the American Public Health Association, and to his University to make the proper retractions and apologies.

#### POLIOMYELITIS

**The Outbreak in 1934.**—The July issue of CALIFORNIA AND WESTERN MEDICINE contained an article, on page 13, by Dr. J. L. Pomeroy,

Health Officer of Los Angeles County, in which the 1934 epidemic in Los Angeles County was in particular discussed, and references made to outbreaks of that disease in the years 1912, 1916, 1920, 1925, 1930. The existence of the entity, known in its various forms in different portions of the United States as poliomyelitis, cannot be gainsaid, and its recurrence is something to be reckoned with in California. Because of the widespread fear of poliomyelitis which prevails among members of the public as a result of the portrayal, in lay publications, of its dread nature and after-effects, it is more important than ever that all measures likely to aid in overcoming its spread, when it is found in communities, should be fully utilized.

In spite of the lack of accurate knowledge concerning many pathologic and other phases of this morbid process, regardless of whether what is looked upon by some as poliomyelitis and held by others to be something else, may or may not be one and the same disease, the fact still remains, that certain structural change and symptom groups, called poliomyelitis, are responsible for morbidity manifestations associated with serious sequelae such as paralyses, and even death. It is most important that the disease should be recognized as early as possible, and at a time when its initial symptoms and signs may not be easily mistaken for much simpler and innocent infections. It is particularly desirable that members of the medical profession be informed of new outbreaks, wherever found in the State, so that alert, and with thoroughly proper coöperative effort, they may be in a position to more efficiently combat the malady. Otherwise, the health and lives of citizens of the State, and other public health interests, will not be fully protected.

\* \* \*

**Articles on Poliomyelitis Printed in This Issue.**—On page 111 of the current issue of this JOURNAL, Dr. E. W. Schultz of Stanford University, presents the results of some recent studies, under the title, "On the Problem of Immunization Against Poliomyelitis"; and on page 123 will be found another article, by Dr. R. W. Meals, giving additional information concerning the 1934 outbreak in Los Angeles. The attention of our readers, therefore, is called to these informative papers.

\* \* \*

**The Present Situation.**—Before leaving the subject, it may be in order to append some excerpts from the minutes of recent meetings of the medical board of the attending staff of the Los Angeles County Hospital and of the California State Board of Health, dealing with a recent outbreak in Los Angeles which, it is hoped, will be of short duration. These are printed because it seems wiser to permit physicians to get their latest knowledge of poliomyelitis from authoritative sources rather than vague and misleading articles in the newspapers, and also in the belief that the following items may prove of interest: